

**Minutes of the regular meeting of the Georgetown Township Planning Commission, held
Wednesday, February 4, 2015**

Meeting called to order by Chairman Honderd at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Greg Honderd, Don Hebler, Tom Doyle, Richard VanderKlok, Jeannine Bolhouse, Steve Hall, Scott Blouw

Absent: None

Also present: Mannette Minier, Zoning Administrator

#150204-01 – Agenda for February 4, 2015

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Steve Hall, to approve the agenda as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#150204-02 – Minutes of the regular December 3, 2014 meeting

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Steve Hall, to approve the minutes as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#150204-03 – Planning Unit Development (PUD0603-01) DeVries Properties Inc., 1345 Monroe, Grand Rapids, is requesting approval for a revised preliminary plan and final development plan for a mixed use planned unit development for residential uses, retail and restaurant, and office and commercial uses, on parcels of land described as P.P. # 70-14-26-200-073 and -074, located at 850 44th St. and 6069 8th Ave., in a currently zoned (PUD) Planned Unit Development district, Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan

- a. [Application](#),
- b. [Soil erosion plan](#),
- c. [Dimension plan](#),
- d. [Exterior lighting plan](#),
- e. [Overall preliminary plan](#),
- f. [Final development landscape plan](#),
- g. [Narrative statement](#),
- h. [North elevation](#),
- i. [West elevation](#),
- j. [Access Management excerpts](#) from MDOT Access Management Guidebook,

Don DeGroot, Exxel Engineering, represented the applicant and presented the request. Ed DeVries, Rick Voorhies and Eric Lee were also present representing the project.

The Zoning Administrator presented a [staff report](#).

Richard VanderKlok stated the following. He liked the integration of the Master Plan. He had no problem with the tree situation. He reviewed the Access Management Guidebook excerpts and was in favor of the driveway connection. He wanted to know the thoughts of the other commissioners, though he understood why the applicant did not want the driveway connection.

Jeannine Bolhouse stated the following. She was okay with the acreage and okay with allowing the waivers. The plan looked great and she understood why they wanted the waivers. The

greenbelt was okay. She was okay with the sign proposal. She was in favor of the driveway and pedestrian connection.

Scott Blouw said that this was an opportunity to have the driveway provided and was okay with the sign proposal.

Greg Honderd stated the following. The driveway access is needed, though he understood why the condo owners did not want it. However, it did not make sense to think that people would use the connection as an exit because it would not be a shortcut. It would be good for the condo owners who wanted to access the new development and they would not have to go out on 44th St. It is good access management to require the driveway connection and the pedestrian connection. He thought that this would be a good location for a gas station because none were close and there was a need for one. If the architectural features vary slightly it would be okay because this site was slightly removed from the rest of the buildings, though it was important for the developers to be aware of the requirement that the architectural features of the structures be similar.

Steve Hall said that the driveway connection would not add traffic to the condos, but would only be convenient for the condo owners.

Tom Doyle said that he agreed it would be a good location for a gas station and agreed there should be a driveway connection.

The chairman opened the floor to public comments.

Rick Voorhies said that he lives in the Gleneagle condos and said that the owners hate the traffic and were opposed to the driveway connection.

Ed DeVries, DeVries Properties, said that he initially thought the driveway connection would be good and he still does, though he knows the condo owners do not want it.

The chairman closed the floor to public comments.

Don DeGroot stated the following. He had read the excerpts from the Access Management Guidebook and they are typically not for a mixed use development with commercial and residential. That is not the intent of access management. This is mostly commercial. Gleneagle is private and there is no technical right for the access. It is possible the condo owners would use it, but there could be problems with the condos. After the public hearing in 2006 for this development, the connection was removed from the plan in response to the negative reaction from the condo owners. The developer has no intention to abuse the additional signs, but after adding the pedestrian connections to the interior of the site, they found it would be necessary to identify the business to the interior area for pedestrians. They would get more specific about the signs after the development takes place.

It was noted that a motion should clarify that the use of a gas station would be allowed in the PUD and would only have to follow the regular process of being approved as a final development plan.

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Don Hebeler, to adopt the [staff report](#) (review) as findings of fact and to approve (PUD0603-01) DeVries Properties Inc., 1345 Monroe, Grand Rapids, to have a revised preliminary plan and final development plan for phase one, for a mixed use planned unit development for residential uses, retail and restaurant, and

office and commercial uses, such as a gas station, on parcels of land described as P.P. # 70-14-26-200-073 and -074, located at 850 44th St. and 6069 8th Ave., in a currently zoned (PUD) Planned Unit Development district, Georgetown Township, Ottawa County, Michigan,

As shown on the following documents:

1. [Application](#),
2. [Soil erosion plan](#),
3. [Dimension plan](#),
4. [Exterior lighting plan](#),
5. [Overall preliminary plan](#),
6. [Final development landscape plan](#),
7. [Narrative statement](#),
8. [North elevation](#),
9. [West elevation](#),

Based on the findings that:

1. The qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 are met as proposed;
2. The information as per Sec. 22.8(D) and 22.5 is provided, and
3. The plan meets the ordinance requirements of Sec. 22.10 as follows:
 - a. The qualifying conditions in Sec. 22.2 are met;
 - b. The proposed PUD is compatible with surrounding uses of land, the natural environment, and the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the development;
 - c. The proposed uses within the PUD will not possess conditions or effects that would be injurious to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community;
 - d. The proposed project is consistent with the spirit and intent of the PUD District, as described in Section 22.1 and represents an opportunity for improved or innovative development for the community that could not be achieved through conventional zoning;
 - e. The proposed PUD meets all the site plan requirements of Chapter 22 including Section 22.8, D.
 - f. The deviations as noted on the plan are acceptable because they will result in a higher quality of development than would be possible using conventional zoning standards and based on mitigating factors, including, but not limited to the following:
 - The PUD with the acreage of 9.64 meets the intention of the PUD chapter and is acceptable.
 - The pedestrian connection to the west at the northwest of the site is acceptable or it may be a driveway connection with a pedestrian connection.
 - The proposed greenbelt along the western property line of Dr. Lee's office parcel is acceptable as shown with 6 evergreens and 6 deciduous trees.
 - The proposals for the freestanding and wall signs are acceptable and shall be in accordance with other ordinance standards (i.e. for size).
 - All of the rest of the requested waivers are acceptable.

And with the following conditions:

- a. As per Sec. 22.2(B), the site must be serviced by public water and sanitary sewer, which is to be coordinated with the Department of Public Works.
- b. Sign permits are required for all sign installation.

- c. **Sidewalks shall be installed as shown on the plan unless specifically waived by the Township Board.**
- d. **A note on the narrative indicates that the proposals is to have coordinated building relationships. The architectural character of all future structures in all future phases shall coordinate with the architectural styles contained with this proposal.**
- e. **The following must be submitted to the Township at the time a building permit application is submitted to the Township.**
 1. **A Storm Water Drain Permit from the Water Resources Commission's Office.**
 2. **PUD agreement as per Sec. 22.11.**
 3. **The PUD agreement shall contain language related to the maintenance of the open space and the landscaping.**
 4. **Approval from the Ottawa County Road Commission for the driveway accesses.**
 5. **All outstanding fees are paid prior to any building permits being issued.**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#150204-04 – Communications, Letters and Reports

- A. [Email request](#) from Amy Caldwell for chicken ordinance;
- B. [Email request](#) from Jonathan Mulder for chicken ordinance;
- C. [Email request](#) from Richard and Mary Mapes;
- D. [document](#) with RTFA info and explanation,
- E. [June 4, 2014](#) PC minutes motion #140604-04 with discussion to not initiate ordinance for chickens

There was a discussion about adopting an ordinance allowing chickens in the lower density residential districts. Comments included:

- Wait until MTA and Michigan State University comes out with a model ordinance which is due in March because the experts will study the use and may be more knowledgeable about the subject.
- Some municipalities already have ordinances and those will be reviewed.
- Some provisions in the ordinances of the neighboring municipalities include provisions for no slaughtering and we should find out why.
- The number should be limited and there should be no roosters.
- There will be problems with dogs and cats eating the chickens or the chickens getting out and eating things in the neighbor's garden.

The following people spoke in support of adopting an ordinance allowing chickens in the lower density residential districts:

- Dave Larkin, 1893 Cottonwood;
- Bob Oosterheert, 7544 North Garden Ct.;
- Kelly Smedley, 6730 White Oak Ct.;
- Lori McPeck, 2695 Bauer Rd.

The consensus of the Planning Commissioners was that they were not opposed to reviewing and adopting an ordinance allowing chickens in a residential district after obtaining and reviewing ordinances from neighboring municipalities and the model ordinance from MTA and Michigan State University which is due to come out in March.

#150204-05 – Request for Ordinance Change

- A. [Letter requesting](#) ordinance change to Land Division Ordinance ([review](#), [PC minutes of June 16, 2013](#) discussed changing)

There was discussion about revising the ordinance to allow a greater depth to width ratio than 4 to 1, which is the same ratio required in the Land Division Act effective March 31, 1997.

Scott Blouw said that he works with other municipalities and in his experience no municipality around here allows a greater depth to width ratio than 4 to 1. He said that he would be concerned that revising the ordinance to allow a greater depth to width ratio would create problems.

Greg Honderd said that the property owner has the option to add the additional northern portion of the property to the parcel to the west that he owns. He said that would be preferable rather than to change the ordinance and to create other undesirable parcels.

Steve Hall asked if they could request a variance.

The zoning administrator stated that they had the right to request a variance, but they had to meet the standards listed in the Zoning Enabling Act and in the Zoning Ordinance in order for the ZBA to grant a variance. She said that one standard is that the situation cannot be self-created and creating an illegal lot could be determined to be a self-created situation. She said that there had to be unusual circumstances related to the property in order for a variance to be granted.

Scott Blouw said that some unusual circumstances that may warrant a variance could be related to topography or a body of water.

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Jeannine Bolhouse, to not initiate a Zoning Ordinance amendment to change the depth to width ratio for a land division and to leave the Land Division Ordinance requirements as they currently exist.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#150204-06 – Election of Officers (current officers: Greg Honderd-Chairperson; Scott Blouw-Vice Chairman; Don Hebler-Secretary)

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Tom Doyle, to elect Greg Honderd as Chairperson.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Moved by Jeannine Bolhouse, seconded by Richard VanderKlok, to elect Scott Blouw as Vice Chairman.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Moved by Steve Hall, seconded by Scott Blouw, to elect Don Hebler as Secretary.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#150204-07 – Master Plan Discussion

There was discussion about the joint meeting for input for updating the Master Plan. Comments included the following:

- The liquor license ordinance does not allow a brewery.
- Not many revisions need to be made to the current Master Plan.
- The input from Mike Asiala at the meeting was very valuable.
- Development will be market driven.
- Even though there are uses that the Township would like to see in a particular area, a developer has to come forward to develop property.
- There are no major problems with the current Master Plan.
- The economics have changed in the past few years.
- There was good discussion about mixed uses.

The consensus was to have more discussion at the next Planning Commission meeting.

#150204-08 – Other Business**#150204-09 – Public Comments****#150204-10 – Adjournment**

Moved by Richard VanderKlok, seconded by Don Hebler, to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.